

best in his professional service here forward.

Mr. REID. Will my friend yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am embarrassed that I have not come prior to tonight and said something about GEN Al Lenhardt. I have served in the Senate a long time, and we have had some very fine Sergeants at Arms. But for the time and place, he was what we needed.

He is a man who had been literally under fire when he was in the military. He had been head of all the MPs in the Army. And for him to step in here, it was a perfect time, when we were going through all the trouble we had.

I have gotten to know him extremely well. He has been a personal asset to me and to all the Senators. As the distinguished Senator from Utah mentioned, staff and a number of Senators do not know how much he has done. Someday maybe something will be written about everything he personally went through to make sure this place is very safe.

I very much appreciate the Senator from Utah mentioning this fine man. This is not a partisan issue. Those of us who worked with him know what a wonderful job he has done. This is a spoils system we have here, and there are things that happen when there are new administrations, and I accept that.

I personally am going to miss him. He is a fine American. He has rendered great service to the Senate and to our country.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I would also note that at the request of the majority leader, I was somewhat involved in the selection process to come up with a successor to Al Lenhardt. I can assure the Democratic whip and all other Senators that in the new Sergeant at Arms Pickle, we have a worthy replacement for Sergeant Lenhardt.

Mr. REID. General Lenhardt.

Mr. BENNETT. Now General Lenhardt. All right. I am very comfortable that the new Sergeant at Arms will carry on the same level of professionalism and provide the same level of protection for the Senators and our staffs that we have seen before.

It is a tribute to General Lenhardt that he has agreed to stay on until March 17 to see that the transition is as seamless as possible and that we do indeed maintain the level of safety we now have.

As good as the hands we have been in in the past, we will remain in good hands in the future.

SENATE ENGAGEMENT

Mr. WARNER. The public, today, across this Nation is exercising our greatest freedom, freedom of speech. Central to many town meetings, central to the media today, are the issues relating to Iraq. I find this strong and thoughtful debate, no matter on which side of the issue individuals or writers

may be, extremely important at this key time in America's history.

I have been fortunate to be on planet Earth somewhat longer than many, and I have been fortunate to have been on the scene and been in a position to observe World War II, Korea, Vietnam and, this being my 25th year in the Senate, together with my colleagues in this Chamber over these many years, these wonderful years, I have been in a position to observe, and if I may say with some modesty, participate in those decisions facing our Nation as it relates to national security.

I have said many times of recent that this particular framework and decisions facing this President, President George Bush, this very courageous President, are as complicated, if not more complicated, than any I have ever seen in this span of my 76 years.

I commend our President and his team—Secretary of State Powell, Secretary Rumsfeld, National Security Adviser Rice, and many others. I followed, as I hope other colleagues did, another brilliant speech given today by the Secretary of State—no equivocations, respect for others and their views, but clearly staying the course, a course on which our Nation embarked to pursue diplomacy to resolve these issues. Iraq is foremost in our minds but close in parallel to significance is the Korean peninsula. There, again, we are being confronted with a situation that requires the strongest of commitments and the strongest of diplomacy. And our President, again, is guiding that diplomacy such that we should address this issue in a multilateral context. I think he is on the right track.

Worldwide terrorism: How many could have foreseen before September 11 that this country would be in the grip, not of state-sponsored terrorism—some state-sponsored but now more the individual. The al-Qaida, the Hamas, you can recite these organizations that challenge our freedoms, our very security, and our most precious security at home.

Yes, America is engaged in this important debate. I commend all. There is a diversity of thought, and I am perfectly willing to listen carefully and heed the thoughts of others. But in that debate a question has arisen, and an important one: What has been, what is, and what is to be, the role of the Congress, and most particularly, the Senate?

The Senate is known and respected worldwide as a debating society; an institution where we have this marvelous opportunity for unlimited debate in certain instances, but most significantly, debate among 100 individuals, well-informed, very conscientious Members who work hard at their duties. We are the world's greatest institution for deliberations, and I am proud, modestly, to be a part. But we symbolize the hope across this world for freedom such as we enjoy in the United States, the hope to fight despair and hunger and political oppression.

The Senate so often and carefully addresses those issues day by day.

As there is diversity of views in debate on Iraq across this Nation, there is diversity among Members in the Senate. That is the way it should be. Therein lies our strength. But there are some who have come up with some viewpoints which I simply do not share.

Some in this Chamber have exercised their very right to criticize the body as an institution for what it has done, is doing, and, more particularly in their views, has not done. Some have gone so far as to say, "We are sleepwalking through history;" "this Chamber is hauntingly silent."

Those are strong words, and words that I heed, and listen to, and in this instance I have great respect for the marvelous Senator who stated those words.

I can remember in the debate on Iraq that we had back in November, 5 hours one day, debating with that particular Senator, whom I admire. So the debate goes on.

But my point is, even though the rafters of this Chamber are not rattling with the rhetoric on Iraq, there are many very important functions going on beyond this Chamber, in the halls of the Senate, in the committee rooms, in the offices of Senators, throughout the entire infrastructure of this institution—in our field offices in our respective States where I and others so frequently meet our constituents. The debate on Iraq is taking place in a responsible way, in my judgment, in the Senate, and this institution is fulfilling its role.

Other Senators have criticized our President. We are really at war now. Yes, I agree that diplomacy is still at work and that final decision to go or not to go is yet to be made by our President, by the very courageous Prime Minister Tony Blair, and other heads of state and government of the group of willing nations, those willing to face up to the need to remove weapons of mass destruction from Saddam Hussein. Yes, they criticize the President. But really we are at war now, and I question how severe that criticism should be.

I was with the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. LEVIN, the distinguished chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. ROBERTS, and the vice chairman, Mr. ROCKEFELLER. The four of us toured Afghanistan and the Persian Gulf region. As we were there, missions were being flown in Operation Northern Watch, Operation Southern Watch, and other activities were taking place regarding which I am not at liberty to describe, nor should I describe, here on the floor.

But men and women in the uniform of the United States, and indeed a great many civilians—particularly those of the Agencies and Departments of this Government who perform our intelligence missions throughout the

world—are taking grave risks at this very hour. For that reason, I think we should exercise a measure of restraint and caution exercising our right to criticize, be it the President or criticize this institution. I looked into the faces of those individuals, some who might well have been involved in the recent capture of this individual who allegedly plotted 9/11, planned it, and those plans might well have included the very building in which I am so privileged to stand at this time. We shall learn in due course more and more about the aims of the terrorists who struck us on 9/11, the aims of the terrorists who are still planning to strike us.

But let the debate go on. This is a strong nation, and our citizens are of a strong mind, and our citizens are of a fair mind. Our citizens are very mindful of those in uniform, and those not in uniform, who today are taking the risks beyond our shores to interdict those who would bring harm to these great United States of America.

Homeland defense, how important that subject is. Our President again has led. We created that Department. But homeland defense begins beyond the shores where the men and women of the Armed Forces and civilians and others are stationed, in so many nations. It begins there for the reason that, to the extent they can interdict, to the extent they can crush the terrorists before their plans are unwrapped to inflict damage on our beloved homeland—that is where homeland defense begins.

So my reply today to my good friends who have taken this institution and called upon it in certain ways, as to what it is doing, I would say most respectfully that the Senate as a body has been, is, and will continue to be responsibly engaged in this debate; responsibly engaged in the consultation as it relates to these issues, consultation with the administration, consultation with our constituents, consultation with heads of governments and states—which I was privileged to do on this trip with my colleagues—consultation with our militaries of the United States and the military leaders of other nations.

There is a broad range of activity by many Members of this body, a broad range of activities that I think are as important as any debate that takes place on the floor of the Senate.

We had a historic debate, as I alluded, last fall. My calculation—others' may be different—is that debate lasted longer than the one we had in 1991. I remember that debate very well. I was privileged to be one of the coauthors of the resolution, as I was a coauthor of this resolution, this resolution which, after this very lengthy debate, was adopted with a strong vote of support for our President to have the authority to use force—77 strong votes.

But those activities did not end. In other words, there were many activities going on apart from the debate at

that time: The same series of meetings and briefings, the same consultations going on just prior to that debate and during that debate. Those same meetings have continued on to this very hour. I am proud of the role of this institution. I am proud of it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a chronology that I put together of the meetings in which I have participated with many other Senators. For example, on September 4, a meeting to discuss Iraq with President Bush at the White House; a number of us were there; September 5, a briefing on Iraq with CIA and DOD officials; programs, 25 in number, of all of the times that I have been involved. Most particularly, I am very proud of the record of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Again in the fall, under the able chairmanship of my distinguished colleague here. We have been at business, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SASC/SENATE CHRONOLOGY OF ACTIVITY ON IRAQ

SEPTEMBER 2002

9/4: Meeting to discuss Iraq with Pres. Bush, The White House.

9/5: Briefing on Iraq with CIA/DOD officials.

9/9: Briefing on Iraq with CIA/DOD officials.

9/17: Closed SASC Hearing to discuss Iraq w/George Tenet, Admiral Jacoby.

9/19: SASC Hearing to receive testimony on Iraq from Gen. Myers and Sec. Rumsfeld.

9/23: Full SASC Hearing to discuss Iraq with Gen. Shalikashvili, Gen. Clark, Gen. Hoar, Lt. Gen. McInerney.

9/25: Full SASC Hearing to discuss Iraq, Dr. James Schlesinger and Sandy Berger.

OCTOBER 2002

10/8: Senators Briefing to discuss Iraq.
10/8-10/11: Senate debate and vote on authorization of use of force against Iraq.

10/6: Senators Only Briefing with Sec. Rumsfeld and Gen. Myers.

NOVEMBER 2002

DECEMBER 2002

12/10: SASC Briefing by Sec. Wolfowitz and Gen. Pace to discuss current operations.

JANUARY 2003

1/9: Meet with Sec. Rumsfeld, Senator Levin, Congressman Skelton and Congressman Hunter, Pentagon. Budget and Iraq issues discussed.

1/15: Closed Hearing on current and potential military operations with Sec. Rumsfeld and Gen. Myers.

1/15: Closed Briefing on Iraq and weapons inspection by CIA and DIA.

1/17: Meeting with George Tenet.

1/23: Senators Only Briefing with Sec. Powell and Sec. Rumsfeld.

FEBRUARY 2003

2/5: Meeting to discuss Iraq with President Bush, Dr. Rice, Senate Leadership and Chair/Ranking Members of SASC, Intel, FR, White House.

2/12: SASC Hearing on Worldwide Threats with Director Tenet and Adm. Jacoby.

2/13: SASC Hearing regarding DOD Authorization for FY04 with Sec. Rumsfeld and Gen. Myers.

2/25: SASC Hearing to discuss DOD Authorization with Service Chiefs.

2/26: Closed SASC Briefing on Planning for Post Conflict Iraq with Feith.

MARCH 2003

3/4: Closed SASC Briefing on current operations by Lt. Gen. Schwartz (J-3) and Major Gen. Shafer (J-2).

Mr. WARNER. Here is the record. Decide for yourselves. I would like most respectfully to encourage the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to likewise put in the RECORD the activities which they as individuals, they as leaders of their committee, have done in connection with this very important issue, or series of issues facing our Nation today.

The Armed Service Committee and the entire Senate have spent an enormous amount of time reviewing, discussing and debating Iraq. In the Armed Services Committee alone we have had at least twelve hearings or briefings since September 2002 where the issue of Iraq was discussed extensively, if not exclusively. That is in addition to numerous briefings for all Members by Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Powell and other Administration officials. Also, the President, Vice President and other members of the Administration have hosted countless events for Congressional leadership to exchange views on Iraq.

In October 2002, we had a thorough debate on the floor of the Senate on a resolution to authorize the use of force. That debate exceeded the amount of time we spent debating the resolution to authorize the use of force against Iraq in 1991. The resolution passed by an overwhelming vote of 77 to 23.

While there have been many developments since October, the vast majority have all reinforced the case that the authorization for the use of force should remain unchanged. The military buildup has been in support of the President's diplomatic efforts. If anything, the events since October have clearly shown that inspections are not succeeding and there is no compelling evidence that they will succeed in disarming a regime that will not cooperate with the inspectors. We must keep in mind that Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs have been designed to operate under an inspection regime. That is why more time for inspections will not produce substantive results—if Saddam Hussein continues to deny, deceive and defy inspectors.

President George Bush wants to build a broad international coalition to confront the threat Iraq poses to global security. Far from "going it alone," he has taken his case to the United Nations. President Bush presented a remarkable speech to the U.N. on September 12, 2002, that brought to the attention of the world the threat this man, Saddam Hussein, represents. Were it not for the leadership of President Bush and Prime Minister Blair, the world would not be focused on this clear and growing threat to global security.

The U.N. is really the organization that is being tested here. Is it to be a

decisive force in international affairs that enforces the will of its members, or is it to be the organization that stands in the way of timely, decisive action and takes no action to enforce its mandates?

The United States, Britain and Spain tabled a clear resolution this week that reaffirms U.N. Security Council resolution 1441 and the 16 resolutions that came before it, and simply states what is plain to all of us: that Saddam Hussein has failed in this, his final opportunity to cooperate fully with U.N. demands that he destroy his weapons of mass destruction.

The Security Council now must decide whether it will live up to its sometimes difficult responsibilities. By failing to act, the U.N. would only damage its own credibility, not deter the U.S. and the other members of the "coalition of the willing" from exercising their rights and responsibilities to protect the security interests of their nations from the threat posed by Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.

Failure to achieve consensus cannot and should not be used as an excuse for inaction. If our principles, our security, our interests are at stake, we must act, in spite of differences with others, and whether or not others choose not to act for their own reasons.

A strong, clear-thinking and decisive UN can make the world stronger and safer, but a UN unable to make difficult decisions will be of little use in dealing with Iraq and other security challenges, such as North Korea.

Resolution 1441, which the security Council passed 15-0, is not about inspections, it is about disarmament. It is about offering Iraq a final—17th—opportunity to turn away from a rogue, non-cooperative status and become a responsible member of the community of nations, in this case by living up to the terms of the cease fire signed 12 years ago.

With other Senators, I had the opportunity to travel to the Middle East and Afghanistan recently, and I can say without equivocation that our brave young men and women mobilizing in support of this mission are the best trained, best equipped fighting force ever assembled, and the best defenders of freedom any country could possibly have in this situation. They are ready, and so is America, to lead a coalition of nations in disarming Saddam, if necessary.

The decision time is rapidly approaching. We will welcome UN support, but, make no mistake: we will do what is necessary, without the UN if need be. America is ready to face that challenge.

This is not a "rush to war" as some have suggested. Saddam Hussein agreed to disarm 12 years ago this month. The United Nations has passed 17 Security Council Resolutions with regard to Iraq and their transgressions against their own people, their neighbors and the international community. Every conceivable diplomatic, eco-

nomic and military avenue, short of overwhelming force, has been tried. There is one last faint hope that diplomacy can succeed, if Saddam Hussein agrees to fully cooperate and disarm, without further delay. But, it is certainly not a rush to war.

Some have asked, "why now?" I would remind those who ask such a question that the risks of further delay or inaction could be far more costly and devastating than confronting Saddam Hussein now. This is a man who has used chemical agents on his own people and his neighbors. This is a man who has had 4 unimpeded years to accelerate and hide his WMD program. This is a man who is attempting to develop new means to deliver weapons of enormous danger well beyond his own borders. This is a man who has ties to terrorist groups who have sponsored terrorist attacks against U.S. interests. We cannot wait for another 9/11 or similar event before we act.

Meeting with leaders in the Persian Gulf region recently, I was persuaded that there is far more support in the entire Gulf region for disarming Saddam promptly than has been reported publicly. Most of Saddam's neighbors want him removed—quickly—so that he is no longer a threat to them, no longer a force for instability in their region, no longer repressing the quality of life of the people of Iraq.

This confrontation with Saddam Hussein is about disarming a dangerous, brutal dictator. But, it is about other things, including freedom and liberty for the Iraqi people. As our President reminded the world in his address to the United Nations in September 2002, "Liberty for the Iraqi people is a great moral cause and a great strategic goal. The people of Iraq deserve it, and the security of all nations requires it."

Claims that the Administration has failed to plan or prepare for a post-conflict Iraq and accommodate the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people are simply not true. The Departments of Defense and State, along with other interagency partners and international organizations have undertaken extraordinary steps to prepare to meet the security, economic and humanitarian needs of a post-war Iraq. We have received extensive briefings at the staff and Member level detailing these preparations. Can all of the questions be answered definitively? No. To try to do so would be deceiving to our people.

While some have faulted the lack of specificity regarding cost of a conflict or of securing the peace following potential conflict, the Administration has been prudent and honest in its uncertainty about how long any conflict may last and how long it will take to transition to a democratic, free Iraq.

Past administrations have provided quick, unrealistic estimates that satisfied the immediate concerns, but later proved wrong. For example, we all remember the famous claim of the previous administration that we would be out of Bosnia in one year. That was in

1995—we are now beginning our 8th year of military presence in that nation.

I commend this Administration for its honesty. They will share information on costs and duration of any operations when they can have reasonable confidence in the estimates.

Further delay and concessions will not lead to the disarmament of Saddam Hussein. He has proven that for 12 years. He must understand through the strength of our coalition—and, if possible, with the UN—that disarmament without further delay is his only option. As history tells us, "peace in our time" with this man will not be achieved by appeasement. This is a time for action.

I will perhaps at a later date expand on the theme I have spoken about today. But the principal reason I come forward is to show this Senator's strong support because of the action of our President, strong support for Secretary of State Colin Powell in my remarks today, and most significantly strong support for the work of this institution, of which I am privileged to be a Member, and for the work they have done.

I yield the floor.

AMERICAN INTERESTS AT RISK IN RUSH TO WAR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on a number of recent occasions, I have outlined here on the floor of the United States Senate my deep reservations about the Bush administration's rush to war with Iraq, particularly as U.N. inspectors are on the ground and making progress. I am especially concerned that war with Iraq at this time without the backing of our allies and the support of the United Nations will undermine the effective coalition against the more dangerous threat of terrorism. And I believe it is the wrong priority, especially in the face of the current nuclear threat from North Korea.

But I also believe that this administration's conduct of American foreign relations has angered our friends and encouraged our enemies. This chip-on-the-shoulder, my-way-or-the-highway approach to diplomacy has alienated our allies at a time when we need unity to address modern threats.

Recently, a senior member of the U.S. Foreign Service resigned in protest over the administration's approach and its policies. Mr. JOHN Brady Kiesling has served American interests as a diplomat for many years in many difficult situations. And his brave letter of resignation speaks volumes about the dangerous direction of the Bush administration in the conduct of foreign affairs.

I urge my colleagues to pay careful attention to his words, and ask unanimous consent that his thoughtful letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: